UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,394	12/22/2004	Christoph Siegelin	76.0733/PR	2863
41754 THE JANSSON	7590 12/14/201 N FIRM	EXAMINER		
3616 Far West		CHRZANOWSKI, MATTHEW R		
·=	Ste 117-314 AUSTIN, TX 78731		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2186	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/14/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lawfirm@thejanssonfirm.com Pehr@thejanssonfirm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Evaminar Initiated Intensions Summary	10/519,394	SIEGELIN ET AL.
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MATTHEW R. CHRZANOWSKI	2186
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>app</u>	peal brief filed
(1) <u>MATTHEW R. CHRZANOWSKI</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Pehr Jansson (REG. # 35759)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>2 December 2010</u>	Time: afternoon	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: claim 1, appeal brief arguments, specifically towards current app	olication's FIG. 3	
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:  Ban		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A	applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Courtesy call in interest of compact prosecution, pointing out arguments concerning the term "mirror area". First the term mirror area is not used as one of ordinary skill in the art would commonly accept as it's meaning. The claim language defines the term "mirror area" be an area divided into at least two physical areas each desgnated to correspond to a same logical area for storing content written to the logical area. This broad claim language and the specification does not recite that the mirror area has anything to do with the "mirroring" or "copying" or "duplication" of data in the particular area, nor does it appear Applicant argues such. However, as previously discussed with appellant in interview, the subject matter as described in FIG. 3, including a fixed association of physical blocks (ZPx) only mapped to a particular logical block (ZL), and the mirror area is either ZPu, ZPu, ZPi, ZPi concatentated (or each ZP is a separate mirror area, ie. the a single ZP is a single mirror area or the four ZP physical blocks are one mirror area), wherein one of the physical blocks in the mirror (ZPu, ZPu, ZPi, ZPi) is the active area containing the actual up-to-date data, while the other physical blocks are inactive containing old data to be erased or already erased. blocks, etc. The claim language does not reflect such interpretations. If properly claimed, and supported by the Specification it appears this subject matter would overcome the prior art of record, and require further search and/or consideration.

/Matt Kim/ SPE, AU2186